FHWA-WI-EIS-00-01-D

PROJECT I.D. 1390-04-00
JANESVILLLE TO WATERTOWN
STH 26
ROCK, JEFFERSON, AND DODGE COUNTIES, WISCONSIN

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO 42 U.S.C. 4332 (2)(c) AND 49 U.S.C. 303

BY THE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
AND
STATE OF WISCONSIN, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

COOPERATING AGENCY

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
(PURSUANT TO 33 CFR 230)

APPROVALS

7/26/00	(By: Richard C. Madrzak)
Date	For Federal Highway Administration
7/25/00	(By: Patricia M. Trainer for Carol Cutshall)
Date	For Wisconsin Department Of Transportation

CONTACTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

Richard C. Madrzak
Federal Highway Administration
High Point Office Park
567 D'Onofrio Drive
Madison, WI 53719-2814
(608) 829-7510

Carol Cutshall, Director
Bureau of Environment
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 7965
Madison, WI 53707-7965
(608) 266-9626

ABSTRACT

State Trunk Highway 26 (STH 26) is a principal route in south central Wisconsin having national, state, regional, and local importance. This corridor is part of the National Highway System and is designated as a Connector highway in Wisconsin's *Corridors 2020* plan. The route has high existing and forecasted traffic volumes including trucks, high crash rates, and substandard capacity and level of service. A range of alternatives has been developed and evaluated for responsiveness to project need and for social, economic, and environmental impacts. Proposed alternatives consist of upgrading the existing 2-lane roadway to a 4-lane divided rural highway with access management. The existing STH 26 corridor is used to the extent practical with bypasses at Milton, Jefferson and Watertown to provide travel characteristics of an effective state highway/regional travel corridor, to maintain a consistent highway speed, and to minimize relocations and other environmental impacts. Primary impacts include agricultural land acquisition and severances, potential effects on archaeological sites, wetlands, and residential and business relocations.

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIS ARE DUE BY October 30, 2000 or 45 days after the Notice of Availability is published in the Federal Register, whichever is later, AND SHOULD BE SENT TO:

Thomas E. Carlsen, P.E.
Wisconsin Department of Transportation – District 1
2101 Wright Street
Madison, WI 53704-2583

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT STATEMENT

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 USC 4321-4347, became effective January 1, 1970. This law requires that all federal agencies have prepared for every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement (now called an Environmental Impact Statement or EIS). The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is, therefore, required to have prepared an EIS on proposals that are funded under its authority if the proposal is determined to be a major action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

EISs are required for many transportation projects, as outlined in NEPA. The processing of an EIS is done in two stages. Draft EISs are first written and forwarded for review and comment to federal, state, and local agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise and are made available to the public. This availability to the public must occur at least 15 days before the public hearing and no later than the time of the first public hearing notice or notice of opportunity. After this period has elapsed, preparation can begin on a Final EIS.

Final EISs are prepared to reflect the distribution of the draft statement by including the following:

1. Basic content of the draft statement, as amended, due to internal agency comments, editing, additional alternatives being considered, and changes due to the time lag between the Draft and Final EIS.

2. Summary of public hearing environmental comments.

3. Summary of comments received on the Draft Statement.

4. Evaluation and disposition of each substantive comment.

A Record of Decision cannot be completed and signed sooner than 90 days after circulation of the Draft Statement to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or 30 days after submission of the Final Statement to the EPA.

Both the Draft and Final EIS are full disclosure documents, which provide a full description of the proposed project, the existing environment, and an analysis of the anticipated beneficial and/or adverse environmental effects.

Names and addresses of those individuals to contact for additional information, or to provide written comments to, are indicated on the title sheet.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section Page

SUMMARY

S.1 Project Location....S-1
S.2 Project Description....S-1
S.3 Purpose and Need....S-1
S.4 Alternatives....S-3
S.4.1 General....S-3
S.4.2 Screening Process....S-3
S.4.3 Alternatives Considered....S-3
S.4.4 Detailed Study Alternatives....S-6
S.4.5 Preferred Alternative....S-10
S.5 Environmental Impacts....S-10
S.6 Other Activities Required....S-10
S.7 Regulatory Compliance....S-10
S.8 Other Government Agency Actions....S-11
S.9 Unresolved Issues....S-11

I PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION

1.1 STATEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED....I-1
1.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND....I-3
1.2.1 Project Location....I-3
1.2.2 Termini and Study Segments....I-3
1.2.3 Project Status....I-6
1.3 NEED FOR PROJECT....I-6
1.3.1 Route Importance and System Linkage....I-6
1.3.2 Existing and Future Traffic Volumes....I-10
1.3.3 Capacity and Level of Service....I-12
1.3.4 Existing Highway Characteristics....I-14
1.3.5 Crashes and Safety....I-17
1.3.6 Modal Relationships....I-20
1.3.7 Transportation Planning History and Local Interest....I-21
1.4 SUMMARY OF PURPOSE AND NEED....I-25

II ALTERNATIVES

2.1 DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES
2.1.1 General....II-1
2.1.2 Scoping Process....II-1
2.1.3 Screening Process and Methodology....II-3
2.1.4 Stages of Development....II-5
2.1.5 Description of Environmental and Geographical Features....II-8
2.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED....II-11
2.2.1 Range of Alternatives Considered....II-11

2.2.2 South Segment (Segment 1) II-15
2.2.3 Central Segment (Segment 2) II-24
2.2.4 North Segment (Segment 3) II-34
2.3 ALTERNATIVES RETAINED FOR DETAILED STUDY II-48
2.3.1 Description of No Build Alternative II-48
2.3.2 Description of Build Alternatives II-50
2.3.3 Comparison of Detailed Study Alternatives II-59
2.4 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE II-68
[Section 2.4 is reserved for use in the Final EIS]
2.5 OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCY ACTIONS II-68
2.6 UNRESOLVED ISSUES II-68

III AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1 LAND USE AND RELATED CHARACTERISTICS III-1
3.1.1 Geographical Setting III-2
3.1.2 Land Use Planning and Zoning III-2
3.1.3 Land Use Density III-11
3.1.4 Agricultural Land Use III-13
3.1.5 Institutional Land Use III-14
3.1.6 Commercial/Industrial Land Use III-16
3.1.7 Residential Land Use III-18
3.1.8 Cemeteries III-19
3.1.9 Transportation III-20
3.2 SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS III-26
3.2.1 Population Levels and Trends III-26
3.2.2 Population Characteristics – Age and Racial Mix III-30
3.2.3 Economic Setting III-33
3.2.4 Work Force III-35
3.2.5 Community Services III-37
3.3 ENVIRONMENTAL AND RELATED FEATURES III-39
3.3.1 Lakes, Rivers and Streams III-39
3.3.2 Wetlands III-40
3.3.3 Floodplains III-42
3.3.4 Groundwater and Drinking Water Supply III-43
3.3.5 Upland Plant Communities III-43
3.3.6 Wildlife and Aquatic Species III-44
3.3.7 Threatened and Endangered Species III-45
3.3.8 Natural and Conservancy Areas III-45
3.3.9 Public Use Lands III-49
3.3.10 Archaeological Resources III-53
3.3.11 Historic Resources III-55
3.3.12 Soils III-57
3.3.13 Hazardous Materials III-58
3.3.14 Noise III-59
3.3.15 Visual and Aesthetic Resources III-60

IV ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4.1 LAND USE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS....IV-1
4.1.1 Consistency with Local and County Land Use Plans....IV-3
4.1.2 Institutional Impacts....IV-8
4.1.3 Agricultural Impacts....IV-9
4.1.4 Transportation and Community Access....IV-13
4.1.5 Economic Impact on Existing Businesses....IV-23
4.1.6 Servicing of Industrial Sites....IV-25
4.1.7 Residential and Neighborhood Impacts....IV-27
4.1.8 Residential and Business Relocations....IV-29
4.1.9 Environmental Justice....IV-40
4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL AND RELATED RESOURCE IMPACTS....IV-41
4.2.1 Lakes, Rivers, and Streams....IV-41
4.2.2 Wetlands....IV-45
4.2.3 Floodplains....IV-50
4.2.4 Groundwater and Drinking Water Supply....IV-60
4.2.5 Upland Habitat and Wildlife....IV-60
4.2.6 Threatened and Endangered Species....IV-63
4.2.7 Natural and Conservancy Areas....IV-65
4.2.8 Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Impacts....IV-66
4.2.9 Archaeological Resources/Section 106 Review....IV-70
4.2.10 Historic Resources/Section 106 Review....IV-77
4.2.11 Hazardous Materials....IV-83
4.2.12 Air Quality....IV-85
4.2.13 Noise....IV-86
4.2.14 Visual and Aesthetic Resources....IV-89
4.2.15 Beneficial Reuse....IV-92
4.2.16 Energy....IV-93
4.2.17 Construction Impacts....IV-93
4.3 SUMMARY OF INDIRECT AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS....IV-95
4.3.1 Regulatory basis and Definitions of Indirect and Cumulative Impacts....IV-96
4.3.2 Potential Land Use and Socioeconomic Indirect and Cumulative Impacts.IV-96
4.3.3 Tools to Address Indirect and Cumulative Impacts....IV-105
4.4 RELATION OF LOCAL SHORT-TERM USES OF THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY....IV-111
4.5 IRREVERSIBLE OR IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES.IV-112
4.6 MEASURES TO MINIMIZE ADVERSE IMPACTS....IV-112
4.6.1 Traffic....IV-112
4.6.2 Farmlands....IV-113
4.6.3 Acquisition/Relocation....IV-113
4.6.4 Surface Water Resources....IV-114
4.6.5 Wetlands....IV-114
4.6.6 Floodplains....IV-114
4.6.7 Upland Habitat and Wildlife....IV-115
4.6.8 Natural And Conservancy Areas....IV-116
4.6.9 Archaeological Resources....IV-116

4.6.10 Air Quality IV-116
4.6.11 Noise IV-116
4.6.12 Visual And Aesthetic Resources IV-117
4.6.13 Borrow and Disposal IV-118
4.6.14 Enhancements IV-118

V ONLY PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE FINDING, PROTECTION OF WETLANDS
[Section V is reserved for use in the Final EIS]

VI ONLY PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE FINDING, FLOODPLAINS
[Section VI is reserved for use in the Final EIS]

VII COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

7.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT VII-1
7.1.1 Study Committees VII-1
7.1.2 Local Officials Meetings VII-2
7.1.3 Public Information Meetings VII-3
7.1.4 Additional Meetings VII-6
7.1.5 Project Notification and Newsletters VII-6
7.1.6 News Media VII-7
7.1.7 Toll-Free Telephone VII-7
7.2 AGENCY COORDINATION VII-7
7.2.1 Scoping Process VII-7
7.2.2 State Agencies VII-8
7.2.3 Federal Agencies VII-10
7.2.4 Other Agencies VII-11

VIII LIST OF GROUPS RECEIVING COPIES OF THE EIS VIII-1

IX LIST OF PREPARERS IX-1

X REFERENCES X-1

XI INDEX XI-1

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit

1 South Segment – Average Daily Traffic
2 Central Segment – Average Daily Traffic
3 North Segment – Average Daily Traffic
4 Typical Sections
5 Detailed Study Alternatives – South Segment
6 Detailed Study Alternatives – Central Segment
7 Detailed Study Alternatives – North Segment

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix

A Pre-Draft EIS Correspondence
B Post-Draft EIS Correspondence
C Agricultural Impact Statement
[Appendix C is reserved for use in the Final EIS]
D Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan
E Summary of Noise Analysis

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
S.5	Environmental Matrix for Detailed Study Alternatives	S-12
1.3.2-1	STH 26 Existing and Forecasted ADT	I-10
1.3.2-2	STH 26 Average Daily Truck Volumes	I-11
1.3.3-1	Level of Services Characteristics	I-12
1.3.3-2	STH 26 Existing and Forecasted Level-Of-Service	I-13
1.3.4.5-1	Existing Access to STH 26 – Rural Segments	I-16
1.3.4.5-2	Existing Access to STH 26 – Urban Segments	I-17
1.3.5-1	STH 26 Crash Summary – 1994-1998	I-18
1.3.5-2	South Segment STH 26 Crash Rates 1994-1998	I-19
1.3.5-3	Central Segment STH 26 Crash Rates 1994-1998	I-19
1.3.5-4	North Segment STH 26 Crash Rates 1994-1998	I-20
2.1.4	Alternative Development Process Schematic	II-6
2.2.1.4	Design Criteria for Urban Streets Functionally Classified as Arterials	II-14
2.2.2	Summary of Estimated Impacts for South Segment Preliminary Alternatives	II-17
2.2.3	Summary of Estimated Impacts for Central Segment Preliminary Alternatives	II-26
2.2.4	Summary of Estimated Impacts for North Segment Preliminary Alternatives	II-36
2.2.4.5	Summary of Estimated Impacts for Through Town Preliminary Alternatives	II-43
2.3.3	Summary of Estimated Impacts for Detailed Study Alternatives	II-60
3.1.3	Land Use Density	III-13
3.1.4	Rock, Jefferson and Dodge County Agriculture Profiles	III-14
3.2.1-1	Historical Population Growth	III-27
3.2.1-2	Projected Population Growth	III-27
3.2.1-3	Projected Population Growth: WisDOA Predictions Compared to County Government Predictions	III-30
3.2.2-1	Population Characteristics	III-31
3.2.2-2	Racial Mix	III-31
3.2.3.2	Personal Income and Per Capita Personal Income	III-33
3.2.3.3	Real Estate and Total Equalized Values	III-34
3.2.3.4-1	Housing Types	III-35
3.2.3.4-2	Household Characteristics	III-36
3.3.2	Wetlands in the Project Area	III-41

3.3.6 Fish Species Likely to Be Found In the Rock River and Its Tributaries III-44
3.3.7 State Listed Species Occurring in or Near the Project Area III-46

4.1 Summary of Land Use and Socioeconomic Impacts IV-1
4.1.1 Existing Local Planning Network IV-4
4.1.3.1 South Segment Farmland Impact Summary IV-11
4.1.3.2 Central Segment Farmland Impact Summary IV-12
4.1.3.3 North Segment Farmland Impact Summary IV-13
4.1.8 Summary of Relocations IV-31
4.1.8.4-1 Available Replacement Housing IV-38
4.1.8.4-2 Maximum Estimated Number of Displacements vs. Available Replacement Housing IV-38
4.1.8.4-3 Available Apartment Rental Units IV-39
4.1.8.4-4 Available House Rental Units IV-39
4.1.8.6 Summary of Relocation Costs IV-40
4.2.1 Pollutant Concentrations in Highway Runoff IV-42
4.2.1.2 South Segment Stream Crossings IV-43
4.2.1.3 Central Segment Stream Crossings IV-44
4.2.1.4 North Segment Stream Crossings IV-44
4.2.2.2 South Segment Wetland Impacts IV-45
4.2.2.3 Central Segment Wetland Impacts IV-47
4.2.2.4 North Segment Wetland Impacts IV-49
4.2.2.5 Indirect (Hydrologic) Wetland Impacts IV-51
4.2.3.3 Predicted Water Surface Elevations for the Regional Flood IV-58
4.2.5.2 South Segment Upland Wooded Habitat Impacts IV-61
4.2.5.3 Central Segment Upland Wooded Habitat Impacts IV-62
4.2.5.4 North Segment Upland Wooded Habitat Impacts IV-63
4.2.6 Potential Impacts to Threatened and Endangered Species Habitat IV-64
4.2.8.1 Section 4(f) Impacts - South Segment IV-68
4.2.8.2 Section 4(f) Impacts - Central Segment IV-70
4.2.8.3 Section 4(f) Impacts - North Segment IV-71
4.2.9-1 Identified Archaeological Sites IV-72
4.2.9-2 Archaeological Sites Potentially Impacted IV-76
4.2.11 Summary of Hazardous Materials Site Ratings IV-84
4.2.12.2 Maximum Projected Carbon Monoxide (CO) Concentrations IV-85
4.2.13.2-1 Noise Level Criteria for Considering Barriers IV-86
4.2.13.2-2 Traffic Noise Impact Summary IV-87
4.2.17-1 Construction Equipment Sound Levels IV-94
4.2.17-2 Construction Noise/Distance Relationship IV-95
4.3.2 Summary of Potential Indirect and Cumulative Impacts for Communities in the STH 26 Study Area IV-106

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure **Page**

1.1 Project Location Map I-1
1.2.1 Project Location Map I-3
1.2.2.1 South Segment Location Map I-4

1.2.2.2 Central Segment Location Map I-5
1.2.2.3 North Segment Location Map I-6
1.3.1.1 WisDOT Corridors 2020 Map I-7

2.2.2 South Segment Preliminary Alternatives II-16
2.2.2.3 Through-Town Alternative – City of Milton II-20
2.2.3 Central Segment Preliminary Alternatives II-25
2.2.3.6 Through-Town Alternative – City of Jefferson II-30
2.2.4 North Segment Preliminary Alternatives II-35
2.2.4.4 Through-Town Alternative – City of Watertown II-38
2.2.4.5 Through-Town Rail Corridor Alternative – City of Watertown II-42
2.3.2.1 South Segment Detailed Study Alternatives Overview II-53
2.3.2.2 Central Segment Detailed Study Alternatives Overview II-55
2.3.2.3 North Segment Detailed Study Alternatives Overview II-58

3.1.1-1 Project Study Area III-3
3.1.1-2 Existing Land Use – South Segment III-4
3.1.1-3 Future Land Use – South Segment III-5
3.1.1-4 Existing Land Use – Central Segment III-6
3.1.1-5 Future Land Use – Central Segment III-7
3.1.1-6 Existing Land Use – North Segment III-8
3.1.1-7 Future Land Use – North Segment III-9
3.1.3 Land Use Density III-12
3.1.9.1 Interstate, US, and State Highway Connections to STH 26 ..... III-21
3.1.9.3 Southeast Wisconsin Railroads III-24
3.2.1-1 Historic Population Growth III-28
3.2.1-2 Predicted Population Growth III-29
3.2.2 Racial Mix III-32
3.3.9.1 South Segment Public Use Lands III-50
3.3.9.2 Central Segment Public Use Lands III-52
3.3.9.3 North Segment Public Use Lands III-54

4.1.8.1 South Segment Relocation Graph IV-32
4.1.8.2 Central Segment Relocation Graph IV-35
4.1.8.3 North Segment Relocation Graph IV-36
4.2.2.2 South Segment Wetlands IV-46
4.2.2.3 Central Segment Wetlands IV-48
4.2.2.4 North Segment Wetlands IV-50
4.2.3-1 Floodplains South Segment IV-52
4.2.3-2 Floodplains Central Segment IV-53
4.2.3-3 Floodplains North Segment IV-54
4.2.3.3 Hydraulic Cross Sections – Crawfish River IV-57
4.2.9-1 Archaeological Sites (South Segment) IV-73
4.2.9-2 Archaeological Sites (Central Segment) IV-74
4.2.9-3 Archaeological Sites (North Segment) IV-75
4.2.10.1 Historic Boundaries St. Coletta School Historic District and Alverno Cottages IV-79
4.2.10.2 Historic Boundaries Slight's Standard Filling Station IV-82

SUMMARY

S.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The section of State Trunk Highway (STH) 26 evaluated in this document is located in south central Wisconsin in Rock, Jefferson, and Dodge Counties. The project begins on the north side of Janesville at IH 90 and extends north about 48 miles (77 km) to approximately 9 miles (15 km) north of Watertown at STH 60-East. Within the project limits, STH 26 passes through the City of Milton, City of Jefferson, Village of Johnson Creek, City of Watertown, and bypasses the City of Fort Atkinson (Figure 1.2.1). In the rural areas, STH 26 passes through the Towns of Harmony, Milton, Koshkonong, Jefferson, Aztalan, Farmington, Watertown, Emmet, and Clyman.

S.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The south project terminus is at the STH 26 intersection with IH 90, a major highway with substantial traffic volumes. The north project terminus is north of Watertown on STH 26 at STH 60 East. At this point, STH 26 connects with a significant east-west highway, and traffic volumes north of this intersection decrease substantially. STH 16 runs concurrent with STH 26 from north of Watertown to STH 60 West, and STH 60 runs concurrent with STH 26 for 1.0 miles (1.6 km) between STH 60 West and STH 60 East, thus adding to the traffic volumes in these sections. The segment of STH 26 between IH 90 and STH 60 East is of sufficient length to address environmental matters on a broad scope, has independent utility, and does not require or preclude development of the remaining section or future options. Therefore, both IH 90 and STH 60 East are logical project termini.

It is intended that the improvement be presented to the State Transportation Projects Commission (TPC) for consideration as a major project in a future program. If the TPC accepts the project, it is anticipated that construction would not occur until at least 2008, with right-of-way acquisition starting in earlier years. Sections of STH 26 will likely be staged for improvement over a period of time, as funds become available.

S.3 PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the project is to provide a safe and efficient transportation corridor having national, state, regional and local importance for STH 26 while minimizing adverse environmental disturbances. STH 26 accommodates the commodity transport of goods and services as a federal and/or state truck route, and provides communities along the corridor with access to local and regional services.

The following is a summary of the key factors influencing the need to improve STH 26 from IH 90 at Janesville to STH 60-East north of Watertown.

- **The corridor is of national, state, and regional importance.** It is included on the National Highway System (NHS), and is classified as a Principal Arterial. The highway is designated as a federal and/or state long-truck route, and is designated as a Connector route in WisDOT's *Corridors 2020* plan. The route links several communities in an area that has historically been an area of high population growth, and provides regional access to schools, health care, and shopping facilities. STH 26 provides the area with direct connection to IHs 90 and 94.

- **The route is of local importance.** STH 26 is the major urban arterial in several communities serving both through and local traffic. Due to the high volume of through and truck traffic, the local function of this route is hindered, and the route acts as a barrier separating parts of those communities. If the route continues to be congested, then safety, mobility, and economic development will be adversely affected.

- **Traffic volumes are high and capacity and level of service (LOS) will decrease in the future.** Traffic volumes will increase approximately 85 to 100 percent by the design year 2028 resulting in volumes two to three times higher than the recommended threshold for a two-lane urban or rural roadway. If no action is taken, the LOS will degrade to LOS "E" or LOS "F" for sections being considered for improvements by the year 2028, which will likely result in traffic diversion to local systems and increased safety problems in the corridor and adjacent local road systems.

- **The corridor is a significant truck route.** STH 26 is the only continuous north-south designated long-truck route in Jefferson and Waukesha Counties. Existing truck volumes range from 1,360 vpd in Milton to 2,500 vpd in Jefferson, and account for approximately 11-18 percent of the average daily traffic (ADT). The high truck volumes, particularly in the downtown areas, disrupt traffic flow and increase hazards to traffic and pedestrians.

- **Crash rates are high.** The STH 26 corridor has a high number of access points, especially in urban areas, and consequently there are a number of segments with higher than average crash rates for the five-year period 1994 through 1998. It is likely that crash frequency will increase if no improvements are made to the existing roadway.

To satisfy project purpose and need requirements, any proposed improvement alternatives must:

- Provide a transportation system consistent with state planning efforts and the intended highway function as a route of national, state, regional and local importance.

- Provide capacity and an adequate level of service for current and projected traffic volumes including trucks.

- Reduce congestion and travel time.

- Improve the safety of the highway by reducing traffic conflicts and the potential for crashes.

The alternatives must also:

- Provide relatively unimpeded traffic flow with an operating speed of 55-65 mph (89-105 km/h) in rural areas, and a substantial reduction in the number of existing access points in urban areas to maintain a minimum operating speed of 40 mph (65 km/h).

- Avoid or minimize adverse environmental disturbances, including impacts to wetlands and other natural resources, and cultural resources such as historical and archaeological features.

- Minimize impacts due to right-of-way acquisition and relocation.

- Support local community needs and interests, and be consistent with local development patterns.

S.4 ALTERNATIVES

S.4.1 General

A range of alternatives was developed for the STH 26 project corridor. Although the proposed solutions address the entire project corridor, alternatives were developed for each of the corridor's three study segments: the south segment (Janesville to Fort Atkinson), the central segment (Ft. Atkinson to Johnson Creek), and the north segment (Johnson Creek to Watertown).

Each of these alternatives was evaluated for its ability to meet the purpose and need requirements of this project. In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines, only those feasible and prudent alternatives that passed the screening process were selected for detailed evaluation in this Draft EIS. Those alternatives that did not meet the purpose and need requirements of this project are also described in this section.

The study process consisted of a preliminary alternative development stage and a detailed study stage. The preliminary stage identified a broad range of alternatives and identified those that met the purpose and need requirements for this project and merited further study. The detailed study stage was a thorough evaluation of those alternatives.

S.4.2 Screening Process

The purpose of the project is to provide a safe and efficient transportation corridor having national, state, regional and local importance for STH 26 while minimizing adverse environmental disturbances. The screening process involved consideration of whether a specific alternative would meet the identified purpose and need requirements for this project, as presented in Section S.3.

Only the alternatives that met the purpose and need requirements of this project and minimized the associated impacts were selected for detailed evaluation in this EIS. The No Build Alternative is also evaluated in detail, as required by 40 CFR 1502.14 of the CEQ regulations, because it serves as a baseline to evaluate the improvement alternatives. The improvement alternatives selected for detailed evaluation consist of eight alternatives, two in the south segment, four in the central segment, and two in the north segment.

S.4.3 Alternatives Considered

Project development included consideration of the following improvement concepts:

S.4.3.1 No-Build Alternative

Under the No-Build Alternative, improvements to the STH 26 corridor would primarily consist of maintenance activities or spot improvements that attempt to maintain current service levels. Generally, the rural section of roadways, including the Ft. Atkinson bypass, would remain a two-lane rural roadway with no change in access. The exception to this is the rural section between Janesville and Milton, which was reconstructed as a four-lane divided rural highway in 1999. Urban sections of roadway in Milton, Jefferson, and Watertown (north of STH 19) would remain as two-lane urban roadways with some

parking and turn lanes. The urban section of Johnson Creek between CTH Y and Baneck Lane is programmed for reconstruction as a four-lane divided roadway in 2001-2002, and the urban section of Watertown south of STH 19 is programmed for reconstruction as a four-lane urban roadway in 2002. There would be minimal change in access in any of the urban communities.

Under the No-Build Alternative, the existing roadways in the urban communities would become more congested than today. This congestion would cause hardship to local mobility, limiting the public's access to businesses, schools, and other parts of the community. As development occurs in and around the corridor, an unimproved two-lane roadway in Milton and Jefferson and the proposed 4-lane plan in Watertown would not be able to accommodate growing traffic. STH 26 would not function effectively as a regional highway and regional traffic would increasingly use less congested local and county roads. The utility of STH 26 for transporting goods to regional, statewide, and national destinations would decline. The No-Build Alternative, while having fewer environmental impacts such as land acquisition and relocations, would not be consistent with the *Corridors 2020* plan and its intended highway function as a route of national, state, regional and local importance.

In summary, the No-Build Alternative would not meet the purpose and need requirements of this project. It was carried forward as a detailed study alternative to serve as a baseline for comparison of Build Alternatives and for evaluation of their environmental impacts.

S.4.3.2 Traffic System Management

Traffic system management measures are generally applicable only in larger urban areas where traffic signal timing, designated use lanes, and other measures can have a substantial effect. Such measures are not reasonable for this predominantly rural project and do not address the purpose and need requirements for the project. For this reason, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration.

S.4.3.3 Non-Highway Alternatives

Mass transit alternatives in the form of bus, light rail, and commuter rail were considered early in the project. Mass transit is typically considered to be an effective transportation solution in larger urbanized areas. The density and size of the population in the communities served along the 48-mile (77-km) STH 26 corridor, and the rural agricultural nature of the surrounding area, make bus or commuter rail service infeasible. Such alternatives would not meet the purpose and need requirements for this project and therefore were dismissed from further consideration.

Passenger heavy rail and inter city buses were also considered. Passenger heavy rail service involves trains at travel speeds similar to Amtrak with limited stops. Service between Janesville and Chicago currently exists. Wisconsin, along with a consortium of other Midwest states and the federal government is planning a network of high-speed passenger rail lines extending from a Chicago hub. Potential station sites include Madison, Watertown, and Milwaukee. Several daily inter city buses provide service between Madison and Chicago along IH 90 with scheduled stops in Janesville, and between Madison and Milwaukee along IH 94.

Passenger rail and inter city buses are not practical for serving existing and future traffic demand, particularly the large amount of truck freight volume, within the STH 26 corridor. Such alternatives would not meet the purpose and need requirements for this project and therefore were dismissed from further consideration. STH 26 does function, however, as the major connector to these services for

communities along the corridor. A park-and-ride lot is being incorporated into the improvement plans for STH 26 and IH 94 at Johnson Creek, with provisions being made to accommodate inter city bus service. Planning for additional park-and-ride facilities in the Janesville area is also being considered.

Development of a corridor to handle freight rail was considered early in the project. Freight rail service currently exists between Clyman Junction and Jefferson as part of the Union Pacific Railroad rail network. The rail line from Ft. Atkinson to Janesville was abandoned and a good portion of the corridor south of Jefferson has been developed into a recreational trail. The rail line from Fond du Lac to Clyman Junction has also been abandoned and now serves as a trail. There are no federal or state programs to finance the construction of new freight rail lines. Multiple rail track corridors exist between the industrial Fox River Valley area, through the Milwaukee area, and into the Chicago area where numerous service connections can be made with major east-west nationwide rail lines. It is unlikely that a new rail line along STH 26 could duplicate the numerous service line connections to the east-west rail lines that currently exist, and thus the service would not be competitive with the existing services. The existing rail lines from the Fox River Valley area to the Milwaukee and Chicago areas can handle additional rail freight capacity. The STH 26 corridor serves the needs of truck freight which typically has more dispersed destinations than rail freight, and hence the need exists for an efficient and effective highway system. This alternative was therefore dismissed from further consideration.

S.4.3.4 Preliminary Build Alternatives

Several alternative bypasses for Milton, Jefferson, and Watertown were considered as well as through-town urban alternatives. All of the preliminary alternatives were based on the concept of providing a four-lane divided facility. Freeway access control standards (no access except at interchanges) would be implemented along the bypass portions of the route. Expressway standards, permitting at-grade intersections and private entrances at controlled spacing, would be applied to the rural segments located along the existing alignment.

The preliminary alternatives discussed below were either carried forward as detailed study alternatives (often with modification) or dismissed from further consideration. They are discussed in detail in Sections 2.2.2, 2.2.3, and 2.2.4. Maps of the preliminary alternatives are also provided following the alternative descriptions for each segment in Figures 2.2.2, 2.2.3, and 2.2.4. Tables 2.2.2, 2.2.3, and 2.2.4 summarize the estimated impacts for the preliminary alternatives.

Through-town alternatives for the cities of Milton, Jefferson, and Watertown were studied in greater detail than other preliminary alternatives. Other preliminary alternatives were dismissed before the January 2000 public information meetings. Through town alternatives were studied in more detail than other preliminary alternatives that were dismissed in order to more thoroughly understand and weigh the associated impacts and to provide a longer time for the public to review and comment on the alternatives. Through town alternatives were included in the alternatives presented for public comment at the three January 2000 public information meetings, in addition to the June 1999 public information meetings. The more detailed analysis conducted for the through-town alternatives in Milton (Alternative 1D, later renamed S1), Jefferson (Alternative 2E, later renamed C5), and Watertown (Alternative 3D, later renamed N3; and Alternative N3R) resulted in the conclusion that these alternatives failed to meet the purpose and need requirements for this project. In addition, each of the through-town alternatives had a number of impacts within the above communities that were adverse, including business and residential relocations, and each would have been subjected to Section 4(f) considerations due to the extensive historic resources within each community that would have been adversely impacted. For these reasons,

the through-town alternatives (S1, C5, N3, and N3R) were dismissed from further consideration following the January 2000 public information meetings, and were not carried forward as detailed study alternatives. These alternatives are described in more detail in section 2.2.1.4. Impacts for the through town alternatives are shown on Table 2.2.2-2.

In addition to Alternative 1D, eight more preliminary alternatives were developed for the South Segment, including three bypass corridors located west of the city, and four bypass corridors located east of the city, and one that passed through the city along the existing John Paul Road corridor. After preliminary analysis and public and agency comment, two alternatives located east of the City of Milton were carried forward for further study, and the other alternatives were dropped from further consideration.

In addition to Alternative 2E, eight more preliminary alternatives were developed for the Central Segment, including five bypass corridors located west of the city and three bypass corridors located east of the city. After preliminary analysis and public and agency comment, two alternatives located west and two alternatives located east of the City of Jefferson were carried forward for further study, and the other alternatives were dropped from further consideration.

In addition to Alternatives N3 and N3R, six more preliminary alternatives were developed for the North Segment, including three bypass corridors located west of the city and four bypass corridors located east of the city. After preliminary analysis and public and agency comment, one alternative located west and one alternative located east of the City of Watertown were carried forward for further study, and the other alternatives were dropped from further consideration.

S.4.4 Detailed Study Alternatives

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines, only those feasible and prudent alternatives that met the purpose and need requirements of this project and minimized the associated impacts were selected for detailed evaluation in this EIS. The No Build Alternative is also evaluated in detail, as required by 40 CFR 1502.14 of the CEQ regulations, because it serves as a baseline to evaluate the improvement alternatives.

S.4.4.1 No-Build Alternative

Under the No-Build Alternative, improvements to the STH 26 corridor would primarily consist of maintenance activities or spot improvements that attempt to maintain current service levels. Generally, the rural section of roadways, including the Ft. Atkinson bypass, would remain a two-lane rural roadway with no change in access. The exception to this is the rural section between Janesville and Milton that was reconstructed as a four-lane divided rural highway in 1999. Urban sections of roadway in Milton, Jefferson, and Watertown (north of STH 19) would remain as two-lane urban roadways with some parking and turn lanes. The urban section of Johnson Creek between CTH Y and Baneck Lane is programmed for reconstruction as a four-lane divided roadway in 2001-2002, and the urban section of Watertown south of STH 19 is programmed for reconstruction as a four-lane urban roadway in 2002. There would be minimal change in access in any of the communities.

By the design year 2028, anticipated traffic volume increases will result in the majority of segments operating at LOS "E" or LOS "F." Traffic will likely divert to local systems resulting in increased safety problems in the corridor and adjacent local road systems.

A high number of existing access points, particularly in urban areas, along with the high traffic and truck volumes, contribute to crash potential. The STH 26 corridor currently has several segments with higher than average crash rates. Crash frequency will probably increase if no improvements are made to the existing roadway.

Although the No-Build alternative would include spot improvements, these improvements will not be able to keep pace with the increasing traffic demands. Level of service will continue to deteriorate as traffic volumes grow, and the number of crashes will remain high. Relatively unimpeded traffic flow with an operating speed of 55-65 mph (89-105 km/h) in rural areas and 40 mph (65 km/h) in urban areas would not be achievable with a No-Build Alternative.

The existing roadways in the urban communities would become increasingly congested, which would cause hardship to local mobility on STH 26 itself, to and from destinations on or near STH 26, and for pedestrians crossing STH 26. An unimproved two-lane roadway would not be able to accommodate anticipated development. STH 26 would not function effectively as a regional highway and regional traffic would increasingly use less congested local and county roads. The utility of STH 26 for transporting goods to regional, statewide, and national destinations would decline. The No-Build Alternative, while having fewer environmental impacts, would not be consistent with the *Corridors 2020* plan and its intended highway function as a route of national, state, regional and local importance.

In summary, the No-Build Alternative would not meet the purpose and need requirements of this project. It is carried forward as a detailed study alternative to serve as a baseline for comparison of Build Alternatives and for evaluation of their environmental impacts.

S.4.4.2 Build Alternatives

Each of the eight detailed study improvement alternatives evaluated in this EIS consists of upgrading the two-lane roadway to a four-lane divided rural highway. The general concept is to utilize the existing highway corridor to the extent practical, with bypasses of communities where necessary to maintain constant highway speed and to avoid excessive relocations and impacts to historic sites. Freeway access control standards (no access except at interchanges) would be implemented along the bypass portions of the route. Expressway standards, permitting at-grade intersections and private entrances at controlled spacing, would be applied to the rural segments located along the existing alignment.

The location of the rural highway alignment will shift from one side of the existing roadway to the other, and the location of the alignment in bypass areas is generally within urban service areas planned for urban growth within twenty years. These alignment characteristics were selected as the best means to avoid or minimize adverse natural resources impacts, as well as property severances, relocations, and conversion of other lands for highway purposes.

WisDOT's guidelines indicate that capacity improvements for a two-lane rural arterial roadway should be considered when the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) reaches 8,200 vehicles. Currently, 90 percent of the rural segments within the 48-mile (77-km) study corridor have traffic volumes exceeding 8,200 ADT. By 2028, almost all rural segments are projected to exceed the 8,200 ADT threshold by two to four times. The eight improvement alternatives carried forward for detailed study will provide the needed capacity and level of service for the corridor's current and projected traffic volumes.

The improvement alternatives will reduce the number of crashes along STH 26, with the most substantial reduction of crashes being in the urban sections. Both expressway and freeway access control standards will reduce the number of traffic conflicts and potential for crashes. The separation of traffic from two to four lanes will reduce intersection and driveway entrance related crashes, as well as head on, rear end, and angle crashes and other variable speed crashes.

A four-lane rural divided roadway with expressway and freeway access control standards for the improvement alternatives will permit relatively unimpeded traffic flow of 55-65 mph (89-105 km/h) along the majority of the STH 26 corridor. The exceptions would be the areas of STH 26 that approach IH 90 at Janesville and IH 94 at Johnson Creek, where it is reasonable to expect a slow down in traffic operations.

The improvement alternatives provide a functionally continuous facility throughout the entire project length. They also are consistent with the *Corridors 2020* plan, which designates STH 26 as a Connector Route.

In summary, the eight improvement alternatives will meet the purpose and need requirements of this project while minimizing impacts to the natural and human environment. Each will address capacity and level of service, problems associated with safety, and will provide system continuity and roadway function consistent with a route of national, state, regional and local importance.

The following sections discuss each of the improvement alternatives in terms of the corridor's three study segments.

S.4.4.2.1 South Segment

Alternative S2 (Figure 2.3.2.1) includes a relocated alignment crossing through the City of Milton that was developed to avoid impacts to several historic properties, two parks, and a school associated with a through-town corridor. This alternative would follow the existing rural 4-lane divided roadway from Janesville to just south of Milton. The corridor would then continue northeast on new alignment and curve to intersect STH 59-East approximately 2000 feet (610 m) east of existing STH 26. North of STH 59-East, the alignment would curve northwest and cross the existing STH 26 corridor about 0.3-mile (0.5-km) north of STH 59-West. Alternative S2 would continue north along the existing route from John Paul Road to the Fort Atkinson bypass as a divided 4-lane rural facility.

Alternative S3 (Figure 2.3.2.1) includes a near east Milton bypass alignment that was developed to direct STH 26 along a narrow corridor between the city and the Storrs Lake Wildlife Area. This alternative would follow the existing rural 4-lane divided roadway from Janesville to just south of Milton. The alignment would then curve north on new alignment and remain approximately 2000 feet (610 m) east of existing STH 26. This alternative would rejoin the existing alignment about 1.5 miles (2.4 km) north of Milton near John Paul Road. Alternative S2 would continue north along the existing route from John Paul Road to the Fort Atkinson bypass as a divided 4-lane rural facility.

S.4.4.2.2 Central Segment

Alternative C1 (Figure 2.3.2.2) includes a west Jefferson bypass corridor. This alternative would follow the Fort Atkinson Bypass to about 2.3-miles (3.6-km) south of Jefferson at Business 26, then parallel the Union Pacific Railroad corridor before heading northwest to USH 18. Part of STH 89-South would be

realigned further west to match STH 89-North. North of USH 18, the corridor would turn northeast, cross the Crawfish River and Popp Road, then head due east across the Rock River. The alignment would curve north before joining the existing alignment north of Jefferson and continuing north along the existing roadway to the proposed four-lane improvement at Johnson Creek.

Alternative C2 (Figure 2.3.2.2) includes a near west Jefferson bypass corridor that utilizes more of the existing STH 26 corridor alignment. This alternative would follow the Fort Atkinson Bypass and existing STH 26 until about 1.5-miles (2.4-km) south of Jefferson. It would then head west, cross the Union Pacific Railroad tracks about 0.8-miles (1.3-km) south of Jefferson, then head due north after crossing CTH J. The alignment would then turn northeast near the crossing of the Crawfish River. The route would then cross the Rock River and turn north before joining the existing STH 26 alignment north of Jefferson. From there, it would continue north along the existing roadway to the proposed four-lane improvement at Johnson Creek.

At the request of a study committee member, two modifications of Alternative C2 were studied which alters the location of the crossing of USH 18 and the Crawfish River. The modifications are limited to the bypass alignment west of the City of Jefferson approximately one mile south and north of USH 18. Beyond these limits, both modifications would follow the same alignment as Alternative C2. The first modification, referred to as C2(a), includes an alignment that crosses USH 18 approximately 1,000 feet (305 m) east of Alternative C2 and approximately 1,100 feet (335 m) west of the Crawfish River. The second modification, referred to as C2(b), includes an alignment that crosses USH 18 approximately 2,400 feet (730 m) east of Alternative C2 and approximately 400 feet (120 m) east of the Crawfish River. See Exhibit 6 for details of the modifications.

Alternative C3 (Figure 2.3.2.2) includes a near east Jefferson bypass corridor. This alternative would follow the Fort Atkinson Bypass and existing STH 26 until about 0.8-miles (1.3-km) south of Jefferson. It would then head east and north, cross USH 18 about 1,000 feet (305 m) west of CTH Y, curve north and northwest, then return to the existing STH 26 alignment north of Jefferson. From there, it would continue north along the existing roadway to the proposed four-lane improvement at Johnson Creek.

Alternative C4 (Figure 2.3.2.2) includes a far east Jefferson bypass corridor. This alternative would follow the Fort Atkinson Bypass and existing STH 26 until about 0.8 miles (1.3 km) south of Jefferson. Farther north, the alternative would cross USH 18 about 0.8-miles (1.3-km) east of CTH Y. Continuing north, the alignment would parallel CTH Y to the east, cross CTH Y south of Junction Road, then parallel CTH Y to the west until matching the proposed four-lane improvement at Johnson Creek.

S.4.4.2.3 North Segment

Alternative N1 (Figure 2.3.2.3) includes a near west Watertown bypass corridor. This alternative would follow the existing alignment of STH 26 until about 0.5-miles (0.8-km) south of Watertown. The alignment would then head northwest and cross the Rock River. The route would turn north and cross STH 19 approximately 2000 feet east of CTH K, then curve east near the northwest Watertown corporate limits, and return to the existing alignment at the existing STH 26/STH 16 interchange. This alternative would continue north along the existing roadway until the northern project terminus at STH 60-East, which would be realigned to connect with STH 60-West.

Alternative N2 (Figure 2.3.2.3) includes a near east Watertown bypass corridor that extends along the existing STH 16-bypass corridor in the northeast portion of the city. This alternative would follow the

existing alignment of STH 26 until about 0.5-miles (0.8-km) south of Watertown, where it would leave the existing alignment and head east. The alignment would then turn northeast, join STH 16 near Gopher Hill Road, and follow the existing STH 16 corridor to the northwest. The alternative would return to the STH 26 alignment at the existing STH 26/STH 16 interchange, then continue north along the existing roadway until the northern project terminus at STH 60-East, which would be realigned to connect with STH 60-West.

S.4.5 Preferred Alternative

This section is reserved for use in the Final EIS.

S.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The primary environmental impacts associated with all of the build alternatives include agricultural land acquisition and severances, wetland impacts, residential and business relocations, floodplain impacts, and potential effects on archaeological resources. Table S.5 summarizes the impacts for the No-Build Alternative and the Build alternatives.

S.6 OTHER ACTIVITIES REQUIRED

This document is in compliance with U.S. Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policies to determine whether a proposed project will have induced socioeconomic impacts or any other adverse impacts on minority or low income populations. It meets the requirements of Executive Order on Environmental Justice 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations." Neither minority nor low income populations would receive disproportionately high and adverse impacts as a result of any of the alternatives selected for detailed study.

Stream and wetland involvement associated with selection of the Preferred Alternative is subject to individual permits under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Relocation Assistance Plans for displaced residences and businesses require approval by the Wisconsin Department of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations per Section 32.25, Wisconsin Statutes.

The bypass alternatives will require a change in the official location of STH 26 per Section 84, Wisconsin Statutes. In addition, jurisdictional transfer of portions of the existing highway would be required.

S.7 REGULATORY COMPLIANCE

The planning, agency coordination, public involvement, and impact evaluation for the project have been conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, Executive Orders regarding wetland and floodplain protection, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Farmland Protection Policy Act, the Executive Order on Environmental Justice 12898, and other state and federal

laws, policies, and procedures for environmental impact analysis and preparation of environmental documents.

S.8 OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCY ACTIONS

Other significant actions proposed by government agencies in the same geographic area as the proposed project include the following projects.

Project	Work Description	Project Status
STH 26 through Johnson Creek	Expand to four lanes	Begin construction 2001
STH 26 – South of Watertown to Main Street	Reconstruct and expand to four lanes	Begin construction 2003
Hwy 12 – Cambridge to Ft. Atkinson	Reconstruct existing two-lane roadway	Begin construction 2003
Hwy 12 – Ft. Atkinson Bypass Including Hwy 12 East to Whitewater	Bypass corridor study	Begin study 2001
US Hwy 12 Whitewater Bypass	Construct new bypass around Whitewater	Begin construction 2002
STH 106 – Ft. Atkinson to CTH CI	Reconstruct existing two-lane roadway	Begin construction 2005
STH 16 – Watertown Bypass and East to East County Line	Resurface existing two-lane roadway	Begin construction 2001
STH 16 – Oconomowoc Bypass	Construct new bypass around Oconomowoc	Begin construction 2003
STH 60 – Columbus to STH 26	Reconstruct existing two-lane roadway	Begin construction 2004

S.9 UNRESOLVED ISSUES

During the course of the study local units of government have requested that WisDOT consider additional interchange access. These are:

- Interchange access on the south side of the City of Milton.
- Interchange access at CTH N southeast of Jefferson under Alternatives C3 and C4.
- Interchange access at CTH A southwest of Watertown under Alternative N1.

In addition, WisDOT is considering a potential relocation of the existing CTH Y intersection between Janesville and Milton under Alternatives S2 and S3.

These issues are unresolved at this time.